

Appln No. 09/575,159
Amdt. Dated September 15, 2004
Response to Office action of July 28, 2004

5

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 37CFR 1.75(c)

In this section, the Examiner has objected to claim 7 as being improper because of multiple dependencies. In view of the Examiner's objection, we have amended claim 7 appropriately.

Claim Rejections – 35USC § 102

In this section, the Examiner has objected to claims 1, 2, 10-15, and 17-18 lacking in novelty in light of Wolff. In view of the Examiner's objections and to obtain speedy allowance of the application, the claims have been amended to introduce further distinctions over the prior art. As a result we believe that all pending claims are novel.

Claim 1 has now been amended to specify that at least one user interactive element is coincident with coded data which enables a user to indicate a response to associated information by interacting with the element using a sensing device which is adapted to sense the coded data and transmit response data to a computer system using the sensed coded data. A basis for this can be found in Figure 1, wherein coded data is coincident with the visual information printed on the form. These features are not shown by the prior art, and we respectfully submit renders the claim novel.

Claim Rejections – 35USC § 103

In this section, the Examiner has objected to claims 1 to 19 as being obvious in light of Wolff. However we respectfully submit that the amendments previously mentioned above render the claim novel and inventive.

Wolff describes a system that includes a single bar code on a page. We highlight Figure 6 of Wolff, wherein a single barcode is positioned at the bottom of the page, which is clearly not coincident with other information on the page. The bar code is scanned by a pen to determine an initial position of the pen, with latter positions of the pen relative to the page being determined based on movement of the pen relative to the initial position, which is achieved using gyroscopic rate information, as set out at lines 16 to 21 of page 11. Accordingly, Wolff only describes the use of coded data representing a single reference point.

Thus, in contrast to the requirement of claim 1, the barcode alone does not allow a user to indicate a response. Instead, interaction occurs when the user subsequently marks an appropriate point on the page, such the rectangles 22 and 22', as set out on page 9 of Wolff.

Thus, the barcode only allows the system to determine a reference point and does not therefore correspond to a user interactive element which enables a user to indicate a response. Furthermore, the user interactive elements of Wolff, such as the rectangles 22 and 22' are not provided coincident with coded data, as required by claim 1.

Thus, Wolff is in contrast to the current method of amended claim 1 which requires that the sensing device be placed in an operative position with respect to the interactive element to

Appn No. 09/375,159
Amdt. Dated September 15, 2004
Response to Office action of July 28, 2004

6

allow the sensing device to detect the coincident coded data and transmit response data to a computer system. In this case since at least some of the coded data is coincident to the user interactive element, the user may operatively use the sensing device similar to a pen such that only the user interactive element to be selected. As a result this does not first require the user to scan an initial location and then move the sensing device to the appropriate location on the form, as required by Wolff.

Therefore we respectfully submit that claim 1 provides numerous advantages over the combined teachings of Wolff. For example, the current system provides the advantage of a single step process of allowing a single click to be used to sense the coded data coincident with the user interactive element, and generate a response, which is in contrast to Wolff which teaches a two step process. Wolff teaches first scanning an initial position on the page (a barcode), and a second step of moving the sensing device to the appropriate user interactive element, such as a calendar book entry.

The current system described by claim 1 is cost effective, as a sensing device capable of sensing movement is not required. Additionally, the current system is time efficient since a two step process of scanning an initial position and then moving the sensing device is reduced into a one step process of concurrently determining the selection of a user interactive element and sensing the coded data coincident with the form. Furthermore, the current system provides the advantage of being more accurate compared to the prior art, which requires using gyroscopic techniques, which inherently incur an element of inaccuracy. Also, the current invention provides ease of use to the user, as the scanning device is able to scan the coded data while simultaneously being operatively used relative to the page to select particular details, which is more intuitive to the user when compared to Wolff.

In the event that the Examiner is minded to reject our above arguments, we respectfully submit that there are a number of additional novel and inventive features included in the remaining claims which are not described by Wolff. In particular, claim 12 requires that the sensing device senses its movement relative to the document using the coded data. Wolff clearly suggests using a gyroscope for determining the movement of the sensing device relative to the form. However, there is absolutely no suggestion by Wolff that the sensed coded data could be used for determining the movement of the sensing device relative to the form. This feature provides many advantages over the prior art such as being cost effective and more accurate. Therefore we respectfully submit that the claim 12 is also novel and inventive in light of Wolff.

Appin No. 09/575,159
Amdt. Dated September 15, 2004
Response to Office action of July 28, 2004

7

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 1 to 19, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email:

kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone:

+612 9818 6633

Facsimile:

+61 2 9555 7762